



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SHASTA-ACHOMAWI: A NEW LINGUISTIC STOCK, WITH FOUR NEW DIALECTS

By ROLAND B. DIXON

Until quite recently, the extent of the area in northern California and southern Oregon formerly occupied by Indians of the Shasta, or Sastean, stock has been regarded as definitely determined. The area was supposed to be limited to the region along Klamath river from the mouth of Scott river up as far as Bogus creek, including the watershed of the two largest southern tributaries of the Klamath in this portion of its course — the Scott and Shasta rivers. The stock was also supposed to have extended northward across the Siskiyou mountains into Oregon, but how far this extension penetrated beyond the mountains was rather uncertain. There were in addition vague statements as to the early occupancy by the Shasta of the extreme upper course of Salmon river.

In working with this stock in 1900, and again in 1902,¹ more definite information was procured by the writer in regard to the Oregonian extension of the stock. It appears that the Shasta formerly extended northward up the valleys of Cottonwood and Jenny creeks, and occupied the entire valley of Stewart river to its mouth. From here they controlled the area along Rogue river, above the mouth of the Stewart, to Little Butte creek, as well as the basin of the latter stream which heads near the base of Mt Pitt. In addition to obtaining the above particulars, vague rumors were heard of an earlier extension of the stock both to the south into the Sacramento-McCloud drainage area, and to the west toward the Salmon. It was not, however, till the season of 1903 that, acting on the suggestions made by Dr A. L. Kroeber and Dr P. E. Goddard, of the University of California, who had been carrying on work among the Hupa and neighboring tribes, I went to the Forks of Salmon in search of what Dr Goddard had thought

¹ In connection with the Huntington Expedition of the American Museum of Natural History, New York.

might be a slightly variant Shasta dialect. This supposed new dialect proved on more careful investigation to be not essentially different from the Shasta as spoken on Klamath river, but a casual remark by one of my informants, as to "the old people's talk," leading to further questioning, resulted in finding that there had formerly been a small tribe at the Forks of Salmon whose language was distinct from any in the vicinity. Unfortunately the last person known to have spoken the language had died two years previous to my visit, and for a time it appeared hopeless to attempt to obtain any material to determine its affinities. By good fortune, however, the two women who were my informants were able, with much difficulty, in the course of several days, to recollect some seventy-five words and short phrases, which they remembered to have heard their father (a mixed blood of the Shasta and the local tribe) use many years before.

The tribe, according to my informants, was known by the name of *Konomi'hū*, and occupied the region immediately about the Forks of Salmon, extending for seven miles up the South fork, and five miles up the North fork. The language, as shown by the scanty material obtainable, is in the main entirely distinct from that of any stock in the region, comparisons with Shasta, Karok, Chimariko, and Hupa failing to show any agreement except in the case of one or two words, which are practically identical with Shasta. On the other hand, the general phonetic character of the language is entirely in accord with the Shasta, as well as is also what might be called its "feeling." The two tribes had apparently very close cultural connections, and claimed to be distantly related. A possible agreement also of one or more verbal stems seems not unlikely, so that for the present, at least, it seems justifiable to regard the new language as probably a very divergent member of the Shasta stock.

Further investigations suggested by this discovery led to the finding of what seems to be a second new dialect in this region, spoken by the rumored Shasta occupants of the upper Salmon. It seems certain that the upper courses of the two forks of Salmon river above the *Konomi'hū* were controlled by a small branch of the stock, speaking a language markedly divergent from the Shasta proper, and that this portion of the stock extended even over the

divide, onto the head of New river. On the whole, this dialect or language is much closer to Shasta proper than is the Konomi'hū, and in some particulars both new dialects or languages agree among themselves. They seem to be sufficiently unlike, however, to warrant their being considered separate dialects.

Although the earlier hints of a greater westward extension of the stock were thus substantiated, no evidence had yet been found of the rumored Sacramento-McCloud tribe and dialect. In 1902 and again in 1903 a number of clues were followed up, only to result in disappointment. Finally, near the close of last season's work (1904) further continued search led to the finding of the long anticipated dialect. From an old woman, living on the upper Sacramento, information was obtained sufficient to show that a small tribe or body of Indians known as the Ōkwā'nuchū had formerly occupied the head of Sacramento river down as far as Salt creek, and the upper portion of the McCloud as far down as Squaw creek, together with the valley of the latter stream. The language spoken by the Ōkwā'nuchū, from the rather scanty material obtained, shows clearly that it is a dialect of the Shasta, but like the New River dialect, while a considerable number of words are nearly or quite identical with Shasta equivalents, there are a large number of forms which show no resemblance at all, either to Shasta or to any other stock language in the region. Contrary, however, to the other new dialects, the general phonetic character of the Ōkwā'nuchū differs quite a little in some points from the Shasta, particularly in its fondness for nasals.

The finding of these markedly variant Shasta dialects brings into prominence once more the question of the possible relationship between the languages of the Shasta and the Achomā'wi, or so-called Pit River Indians. Several years ago Gatschet suggested such a relationship as possible, but did not attempt, from lack of material, to demonstrate it. From the Achomā'wi linguistic material collected by the writer in 1900 and 1903, it seems clear that this relationship is to be regarded as certain, although the detailed analysis of the Achomā'wi is not yet complete. The first result of the investigation, however, is the discovery that the Achomā'wi is not the single language it hitherto has been supposed to be, but in reality consists

of two markedly divergent languages. The one of these is spoken by the Achomā'wi proper, the other by the Atsugē'wi, or Hat Creek Indians, who occupy the valley of Hat creek, together with Burney and Dixie valleys. Of the words of the two vocabularies only about one-third are common to both, if indeed the proportion is not smaller, and many of these show considerable, although regular, phonetic changes. Structurally the two languages are similar in the main, but differ radically so far as regards the actual prefixes or suffixes employed. The two languages, while unquestionably related are yet strikingly unlike.

A comparison of these two languages, the Achomā'wi and the Atsugē'wi, with the Shasta and its dialects, shows clearly that the three are related, although divergent members of a single stock. A considerable number of close lexical correspondences exist, not only between the Achomā'wi, Atsugē'wi, and Shasta proper, but between the former two and Konomi'hū, the New River dialect, and Ōkwā'-nuchū. The following brief table will illustrate some of the more important of these agreements.

| | SHASTA. | KONOMIHU. | NEW RIVER. | OKWANUCHU. | ACHOMAWI | ATSUGEWI. |
|--------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Eye | <i>oi</i> | <i>ki'oi</i> | <i>ki'oi</i> | . . . | . . . | <i>oi'yi</i> |
| Head | <i>in'nux</i> (hair) | <i>ki'na</i> | <i>kin'nux</i> | <i>in'nux</i> | <i>lax</i> | <i>na'xa</i> |
| Teeth | <i>ɛ'tsau</i> | . . . | <i>ki'tsau</i> | <i>ilcūng'wi</i> | <i>i'tsa</i> | <i>i'tsau</i> |
| Ear | <i>i'sak</i> | . . . | . . . | <i>is'sawak</i> | <i>ɛ'isat</i> | . . . |
| Jaw | <i>tsa'wak</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>tsoi'was</i> | . . . |
| Blood | <i>a'xta</i> | . . . | . . . | <i>axta'</i> | <i>axdi'</i> | . . . |
| Liver | <i>āp'ci</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>ōp'si</i> |
| Urine | <i>icuk'wi</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>disoq'</i> | <i>wissuq'</i> |
| Man | <i>ic</i> | <i>kis'apūhiyū</i> | <i>gɛ'ic</i> | . . . | . . . | <i>kus'wīwahau</i> |
| Indian | <i>awadik'wa</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>aotɛ'</i> |
| Water | <i>at'sa</i> | . . . | <i>ga'ats'</i> | <i>at'sa</i> | <i>as</i> | <i>atssi'</i> |
| Coals | <i>xok</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>hauk</i> | . . . |
| Salmon | <i>kiɛ'Er'</i> | . . . | <i>ki'tun</i> | <i>it'ū'ri</i> | . . . | <i>ā'nmi</i> |
| Grizzly-bear | <i>atssɛ'</i> | <i>qamqā'tsinɛ' au</i> | . . . | <i>atc'tcɛhɛ</i> | . . . | . . . |
| Cedar | <i>nā'ho</i> | <i>kin'axo</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>nat'op</i> |
| Wood | <i>ā'wa</i> | . . . | <i>ga'au'</i> | . . . | . . . | <i>a'harwi</i> |
| Spear | <i>arawā'tsu</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>lā'su</i> | <i>nā'su</i> |
| Two | <i>xōk'wa</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>haq</i> | <i>hō'ki</i> |
| Three | <i>xat'ski</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>tsas'di</i> | . . . |
| Eat | . . . | <i>tamā'harwɛ</i> | . . . | . . . | . . . | <i>ā'mma</i> |

A preliminary grammatical comparison shows equally important points of agreement. For lack of grammatical material from

the Konomi'hū, New River, and Ōkwā'nuchū, only Shasta, Atsugē'wi, and Achomā'wi are shown.

| | Shasta. | Achomāwi. | Atsugēwi. |
|---|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Subjective suffix (nominal) | - <i>ka</i> | - <i>ga</i> | [- <i>pa</i>] |
| Instrumental " " | - <i>ta</i> | - <i>a</i> | - <i>a</i> |
| Indep. form 2 ^d pers. pronoun. | <i>mai</i> | <i>mi-</i> | <i>mi-</i> |
| Plural pronominal suffix. | - <i>yawEr</i> | . . | - <i>wir</i> |
| Poss. pronominal suffix. | - <i>mu</i> | - <i>mu</i> | . . |
| Subjective pron. suffix (verbal) | - <i>s</i> | - <i>s</i> | - <i>s</i> |

In view, therefore, of the considerable agreement between these different languages, not only in vocabulary but in important grammatical elements, it seems justifiable to regard them all as members of a single stock. The choice of a name for the new group is a matter of some difficulty, but on the whole the compound term Shasta-Achomawi seems the most satisfactory, as, in spite of its length, it has the advantage of exactly describing the group.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS.